

REMARKS

Claim 8 is amended to more clearly distinguish the first GUI screen and the second GUI screen and more particularly recite that the second GUI screen does not include the route segment on which the vehicle is located as in the first GUI screen. The amendments to claims 14, 21, 27 and 40 clarify that the claimed system or medium determines and displays a second GUI screen that includes a previous route segment or a subsequent route segment that does not include the identified route segment on which the vehicle is located. The amendments are similar to wording previously presented in claim 1 and are provided for clarification.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-31 and 39-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,397,145, issued to Millington in 2002.

The navigation system in Millington displays the GUI screen that includes the current position of the vehicle. Fig. 2 shows a map display view 50 that includes segment of the route 61 that ends at the upper edge of the view. The edge is not the destination, but rather the displayed segment leads to another segment, which is to be displayed in a later view. Also, there may be one or more previous segments that were traveled to arrive at the present location. It is significant that the current display includes a vehicle

icon 52 representing the current position of the vehicle on roads 54, see col. 4, lines 13-15. Thus, Millington displays the route segment that includes the current position of the vehicle. Nothing in Millington contemplates displaying a previous or subsequent route segment that is not included in the view with the current position of the vehicle.

The display in Millington also includes maneuver sequence notations 62. When the vehicle approaches a complex maneuver, the CPU switches the display from the map view 50 to the instruction view 68 in Fig. 4, see col. 5, beginning at line 17. Fig. 4 shows maneuver notations A and B, col. 5, lines 51-54. It does not show C. To show C, the display shifts to the next view 68' in Fig. 5, col. 6, lines 41-45. The shift occurs while the vehicle is in the process of completing the second maneuver instruction 70'', col. 6, lines 44-45. As Millington specifically teaches, the system intentionally waits to display C in order to avoid confusion, col. 6, lines 48-49. Nothing in Millington allows the system to display C before A is completed. Moreover, once A is completed, and the system switches to the view in Fig. 5, nothing in Millington allows the display to return to Fig. 4 to review the prior instruction A. Thus, even when providing complex instructions, Millington shows the current maneuver and the next, but does not allow the user to display other views. A and B when the vehicle is executing A, and B and C when the vehicle is executing B. Each time, the display is based upon the current position of the vehicle.

In Applicants' invention, the system determines a plurality of route segments and displays the route segment with the present position of the vehicle. In contrast to

Millington, though, the system also determines GUI screens for the other route segments and, based upon input from the user, displays a route segment other than the one with the present position of the vehicle. In this manner, the user may view previous or subsequent route segments to anticipate future maneuvers or review prior travel. Millington does not formulate views other than the view with the current position of the vehicle, and does not store them for review. Therefore, Millington does not anticipate or even suggest Applicants' invention.

Claim 1 is directed to Applicants' method that determines a plurality of route segments for a route and distinct GUI screens to represent each route segment. Millington only formats a single view, the view that includes the current position of the vehicle. In accordance with the claim, the method identifies the route segment based upon the position of the vehicle and renders the GUI screen corresponding to the identified route segment. However, in contrast to Millington, the method receives user input and renders the GUI screen for a previous or subsequent route segment that does not include the position of the vehicle. Nothing in Millington contemplates displaying a view that does not include the present position of (or maneuver instruction for) the vehicle. Millington only formats GUI screens that include the present vehicle position, does not formulate displays for other route segments, and so cannot show other segments to the user when requested. Thus, Millington does not teach or suggest Applicants' method in claim 1.

Claims 2-7 are dependent upon claim 1 and not taught or suggested by Millington

for the reasons set forth with regard to that claim.

Claim 8 is directed to Applicants' method that includes, as key steps, determining a plurality of GUI screens corresponding to distinct route segments, displaying a first GUI screen that includes a route segment on which the vehicle is located, and, in response to user input, displaying a second GUI screen that is a previous or subsequent route segment and does not include the route segment on which the vehicle is located. Millington does not determine GUI screens except for the route segment that includes the vehicle position or current maneuver, and does not display previous or subsequent route segments in a GUI screen that does not include the vehicle position. Thus, Millington does not teach or suggest Applicants' method in claim 8, or in claims 9-13 dependent thereon.

Claim 14 is directed to Applicants' navigation system that includes processor-based subsystem that is configured to render a first GUI screen with an identified route segment on which the vehicle is located, and responds to user input to render a second, GUI screen comprising a previous or subsequent route segment. The claim is amended to more particularly point out that the second GUI screen does not include the identified route segment with the position of the vehicle. Millington does not allow the user to display a view having a previous or subsequent route segment other than the route segment that includes the position of the vehicle, and so does not teach or suggest Applicants' claim 14, or dependent claims 15-20.

Claim 21 is directed to Applicants' navigation system, which, like claim 14, is configured to display a second GUI screen comprising a previous or subsequent to the route segment that does not include the vehicle location. For the reasons above, Millington does not show these features, and so does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim 21, or dependent claims 22-26.

Claim 27 is directed to a processor-readable medium that determines a plurality of screens corresponding to graphic representations of route segments, renders a first segment with the identified route segment on which the vehicle is located, receives user input and then renders a second graphic representation of a previous or subsequent route segment that does not include the identified route segment. Millington does not show these features and so cannot show Applicants' claims 27 and dependent claims 28-31 and 39.

Claim 40 is also directed to a processor-readable medium with features like those discussed above with regard to claim 27, and so is also allowable over Millington, along with dependent claims 41-44.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims based upon Millington be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1-31 and 39-44 be allowed.

Conclusion

It is believed, in view of the amendments and remarks herein, that all grounds of rejection of the claims have been addressed and overcome, and that all claims are in condition for allowance. If it would further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Douglas D. Fekete", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas D. Fekete
Reg. No. 29,065
Delphi Technologies, Inc.
Legal Staff – M/C 480-410-202
P.O. Box 5052
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052

(248) 813-1210